

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

NATHAN LORING,)
Petitioner,)
v.)
ALICE PAYNE,)
Respondent.)
Case No. C05-1599-JLR-JPD
ORDER

Petitioner is an inmate at the McNeil Island Corrections Center in Steilacoom, Washington, and has filed a pro se 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition for writ of habeas corpus. Respondent has filed a response opposing the petition. Following a careful review of the parties' pleadings and the record, the Court finds that the petition raises both exhausted and unexhausted claims. Therefore, the Court recommends offering petitioner the option to: (1) amend his petition in order to proceed only with his exhausted claims, (2) withdraw the entire petition and resubmit it once he has exhausted his remaining claims, or (3) show good cause as to why the Court should stay the entire petition pending the exhaustion of his unexhausted state claims.

FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

In the spring and summer of 1996, petitioner lived with his brother's family and their three-year-old daughter, A.J. Dkt. No. 11, Ex. 2 at 2. Several years later, when she was eight,

**ORDER
PAGE - 1**

01 A.J. told her mother that petitioner had sexually abused her when he had lived with them in
02 1996. *Id.* Over the course of the next several weeks, A.J. revealed details of her experience to
03 a nurse at Harborview and to Ashley Wilske, a child interviewer with the King County
04 Prosecutor's office. *Id.* During an interview with Wilske, A.J.'s minor sister, N.L., informed
05 investigators that petitioner had sexually abused her since she was seven. *Id.* at 3.

06 Petitioner was charged with one count of Rape of a Child in the First Degree and one
07 count of Rape of a Child in the Third Degree. *Id.* Before trial, the court conducted a
08 competency hearing to determine whether A.J. was competent to testify, and whether her out-
09 of-court statements to her mother and Ms. Wilske could be admitted into evidence. *Id.*
10 Following testimony by A.J., her mother, Wilske, and an expert in child memory and
11 psychology, the trial court determined that A.J. was competent to testify and admitted her out-
12 of-court statements. *Id.* at 2-5. On April 11, 2003, petitioner was convicted on one count of
13 Rape of a Child in the First Degree and one count of Rape of a Child in the Third Degree. Dkt.
14 No. 11, Ex. 1.

15 Proceeding through counsel, petitioner appealed his conviction to the Washington State
16 Court of Appeals. Dkt. No. 11, Ex. 3. In his brief, plaintiff raised the following assignments
17 of error:

- 18 1. The trial court erred in finding [A.J.] competent to testify;
- 19 2. The trial court erred in admitting [A.J.'s] hearsay statements under the
child hearsay exception;
- 20 3. [Petitioner] received ineffective assistance of counsel;
- 21 4. Prosecutorial misconduct denied appellant his right to a fair trial; and
- 22 5. Cumulative error denied [petitioner] his right to a fair trial.

23 Dkt. No. 11, Ex. 2.

01 After the State filed its responsive brief, petitioner filed a supplemental pro se brief that
 02 raised two additional assignments of error.¹ Dkt. No. 11, Exs. 4, 5. He argued:

03 1 The trial court committed automatic reversible error when it allowed the
 04 untimely midtrial amendment after the state had rested, violating the
 05 statute of limitations; and
 06 2. The [petitioner's] United States Constitutional Amendments 6th and
 07 Washington State Article I Section 22 right to a fair trial was violated
 08 when the trial court judge committed a manifest abuse of discretion
 09 when he erroneously found A.J. competent to testify at trial.

10 Dkt. No. 11, Ex. 5.

11 Petitioner's attorney then filed a reply brief which raised a new issue that had not been
 12 raised in the opening brief or petitioner's supplemental pro se brief. Relying on *Crawford v.*
 13 *Washington*, 541 U.S. 36 (2004), he asserted that the trial court erroneously had allowed A.J.'s
 14 out-of-court statements to be admitted without petitioner having an opportunity to cross-
 15 examine. Dkt. No. 11, Ex. 6 at 1-5. The State moved to strike the *Crawford* argument stating
 16 that it had been raised for the first time in the reply brief. Dkt. No. 11, Ex. 7. Petitioner's
 17 counsel opposed the motion, but the Court of Appeals granted the motion to strike and
 18 affirmed petitioner's conviction. Dkt. No. 11, Exs. 2, 8, 9.

19 Proceeding through counsel, petitioner filed a petition for review with the Washington
 20 Supreme Court, raising the following issues:

21 1. Where [A.J.] could not accurately relate events occurring
 22 contemporaneously with the alleged incident at issue, did the trial court
 23 err in finding her competent to testify?
 24 2. Where [A.J.] was incompetent as a witness and therefore unavailable,
 25 did the trial court's admission of [A.J.'s] out-of-court statements violate
 26 [petitioner's] right to confront his accusers?

27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000
 1001
 1002
 1003
 1004
 1005
 1006
 1007
 1008
 1009
 1010
 1011
 1012
 1013
 1014
 1015
 1016
 1017
 1018
 1019
 1020
 1021
 1022
 1023
 1024
 1025
 1026
 1027
 1028
 1029
 1030
 1031
 1032
 1033
 1034
 1035
 1036
 1037
 1038
 1039
 1040
 1041
 1042
 1043
 1044
 1045
 1046
 1047
 1048
 1049
 1050
 1051
 1052
 1053
 1054
 1055
 1056
 1057
 1058
 1059
 1060
 1061
 1062
 1063
 1064
 1065
 1066
 1067
 1068
 1069
 1070
 1071
 1072
 1073
 1074
 1075
 1076
 1077
 1078
 1079
 1080
 1081
 1082
 1083
 1084
 1085
 1086
 1087
 1088
 1089
 1090
 1091
 1092
 1093
 1094
 1095
 1096
 1097
 1098
 1099
 1100
 1101
 1102
 1103
 1104
 1105
 1106
 1107
 1108
 1109
 1110
 1111
 1112
 1113
 1114
 1115
 1116
 1117
 1118
 1119
 1120
 1121
 1122
 1123
 1124
 1125
 1126
 1127
 1128
 1129
 1130
 1131
 1132
 1133
 1134
 1135
 1136
 1137
 1138
 1139
 1140
 1141
 1142
 1143
 1144
 1145
 1146
 1147
 1148
 1149
 1150
 1151
 1152
 1153
 1154
 1155
 1156
 1157
 1158
 1159
 1160
 1161
 1162
 1163
 1164
 1165
 1166
 1167
 1168
 1169
 1170
 1171
 1172
 1173
 1174
 1175
 1176
 1177
 1178
 1179
 1180
 1181
 1182
 1183
 1184
 1185
 1186
 1187
 1188
 1189
 1190
 1191
 1192
 1193
 1194
 1195
 1196
 1197
 1198
 1199
 1200
 1201
 1202
 1203
 1204
 1205
 1206
 1207
 1208
 1209
 1210
 1211
 1212
 1213
 1214
 1215
 1216
 1217
 1218
 1219
 1220
 1221
 1222
 1223
 1224
 1225
 1226
 1227
 1228
 1229
 1230
 1231
 1232
 1233
 1234
 1235
 1236
 1237
 1238
 1239
 1240
 1241
 1242
 1243
 1244
 1245
 1246
 1247
 1248
 1249
 1250
 1251
 1252
 1253
 1254
 1255
 1256
 1257
 1258
 1259
 1260
 1261
 1262
 1263
 1264
 1265
 1266
 1267
 1268
 1269
 1270
 1271
 1272
 1273
 1274
 1275
 1276
 1277
 1278
 1279
 1280
 1281
 1282
 1283
 1284
 1285
 1286
 1287
 1288
 1289
 1290
 1291
 1292
 1293
 1294
 1295
 1296
 1297
 1298
 1299
 1300
 1301
 1302
 1303
 1304
 1305
 1306
 1307
 1308
 1309
 1310
 1311
 1312
 1313
 1314
 1315
 1316
 1317
 1318
 1319
 1320
 1321
 1322
 1323
 1324
 1325
 1326
 1327
 1328
 1329
 1330
 1331
 1332
 1333
 1334
 1335
 1336
 1337
 1338
 1339
 1340
 1341
 1342
 1343
 1344
 1345
 1346
 1347
 1348
 1349
 1350
 1351
 1352
 1353
 1354
 1355
 1356
 1357
 1358
 1359
 1360
 1361
 1362
 1363
 1364
 1365
 1366
 1367
 1368
 1369
 1370
 1371
 1372
 1373
 1374
 1375
 1376
 1377
 1378
 1379
 1380
 1381
 1382
 1383
 1384
 1385
 1386
 1387
 1388
 1389
 1390
 1391
 1392
 1393
 1394
 1395
 1396
 1397
 1398
 1399
 1400
 1401
 1402
 1403
 1404
 1405
 1406
 1407
 1408
 1409
 1410
 1411
 1412
 1413
 1414
 1415
 1416
 1417
 1418
 1419
 1420
 1421
 1422
 1423
 1424
 1425
 1426
 1427
 1428
 1429
 1430
 1431
 1432
 1433
 1434
 1435
 1436
 1437
 1438
 1439
 1440
 1441
 1442
 1443
 1444
 1445
 1446
 1447
 1448
 1449
 1450
 1451
 1452
 1453
 1454
 1455
 1456
 1457
 1458
 1459
 1460
 1461
 1462
 1463
 1464
 1465
 1466
 1467
 1468
 1469

01 3. Did [petitioner] receive ineffective assistance of counsel where defense
02 counsel failed to object to testimony vouching for [N.L.'s] veracity and
03 testimony by [A.J.'s] father that she exhibited behaviors he believed
04 typical of a female child who had been molested?
05
06 4. Did prosecutorial misconduct deny petitioner his right to a fair trial
07 where the prosecutor argued defense counsel was "desperate" and
08 resorting to the "age old strategy" of "blame the victim," warning jurors
09 not to "fall for it?"

10 Dkt. No. 11, Ex. 10. The Washington Supreme Court denied review without comment. Dkt.
11 No. 11, Ex. 11. On May 6, 2005, the Washington Court of Appeals issued its mandate. Dkt.
12 No. 11, Ex. 12. Petitioner did not file a collateral attack of his sentence. Instead, he timely
13 filed the present 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition for writ of habeas corpus. Dkt. No. 4.

14 CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

15 This § 2254 petition raises four claims for relief:

16 1. The accuser was not competent to testify, in violation of [petitioner's]
17 U.S. Const. 6th Amend right to a fair trial;
18
19 2. [Petitioner's] U.S. Const. 6th Amend right to confrontation was violated
20 when the court admitted hearsay statements;
21
22 3. Defense counsel rendered ineffective assistance, in violation of
23 [petitioner's] U.S. Const. 6th Amend. right; and
24
25 4. Prosecutorial misconduct denied [petitioner] of his U.S. Const. 6th
26 Amend. right to a fair trial.

27 Dkt. No. 1. Respondent contends that the petition should be denied because petitioner has
28 failed to exhaust fully all of his claims in state court. Dkt. No. 8. Alternatively, respondent
29 argues that the petition is a "mixed" petition that should be dismissed without prejudice, or
30 held in abeyance, pending the exhaustion of petitioner's claims in state court. *Id.*

31 DISCUSSION

32 A. This is a "Mixed Petition" That Presents Both Unexhausted and
33 Exhausted Claims.

34 In order for a federal district court to review the merits of a § 2254 petition for writ of
35 habeas corpus, the petitioner must first exhaust his state-court remedies. 28 U.S.C.

01 § 2254(b)(1)(A); *Fields v. Waddington*, 401 F.3d 1018, 1020 (9th Cir. 2005). A petitioner can
 02 satisfy the exhaustion requirement by either: (1) fairly and fully presenting each of his federal
 03 claims to the state's highest court, or (2) demonstrating that no state remedies are available to
 04 him. *Johnson v. Zenon*, 88 F.3d 828, 829 (9th Cir. 1996) (internal citations omitted). A
 05 petitioner fairly and fully presents a claim if he submits it "(1) to the proper forum, . . .
 06 (2) through the proper vehicle, . . . and (3) by providing the proper factual and legal basis for
 07 the claim." *Insyxiengmay v. Morgan*, 403 F.3d 657, 668 (9th Cir. 2005) (internal citations
 08 omitted).

09 The Ninth Circuit requires that a petitioner explicitly identify the federal basis of his
 10 claims either by identifying specific portions of the federal Constitution or statutes, or by
 11 citing federal or state case law that analyzes the federal Constitution. *Id.* at 668; *Fields*, 401
 12 F.3d at 1021 (citing *Lyons v. Crawford*, 232 F.3d 666, 670 (9th Cir. 2000)). This is to ensure
 13 that state courts are adequately alerted to the fact that the petitioner is raising federal
 14 constitutional claims. *Hiivala v. Wood*, 195 F.3d 1098, 1106 (9th Cir. 1999) (per curiam).
 15 Hence, alluding to broad constitutional principles, without more, does not satisfy the
 16 exhaustion requirement. *Id.* Similarly, it is not enough to raise an analogous or substantially
 17 similar state law claim. *Id.*; *Castillo v. McFadden*, 399 F.3d 993, 999 (9th Cir. 2005).

18 1. Petitioner's First and Fourth Claims Are Unexhausted.

19 Petitioner has failed to present fairly and fully his first and fourth claims to the
 20 Washington Supreme Court. In the "Reasons Why Review Should Be Accepted and
 21 Argument" section of his Washington Supreme Court brief, petitioner makes a broad statement
 22 that his case involved "several fundamental rights granted by the state and federal
 23 constitutions: the right to confront and cross-examine one's accusers; the right to effective
 24 representation; and the right to a fair trial. U.S. Const. Amend. VI." Dkt. No. 11, Ex. 10 at
 25 11. However, standing alone, this broad and generalized constitutional reference, detached
 26 from the specific arguments elaborated upon in petitioner's brief, fails to satisfy the exhaustion

01 requirement. It did not adequately alert the Washington Supreme Court to the specific federal
02 issues petitioner now purports to raise. *Castillo*, 399 F.3d at 999, 1001; *Hiivala*, 195 F.3d at
03 1106.

04 Petitioner describes his first claim as “[t]he accuser was not competent to testify, in
05 violation of [petitioner’s] U.S. Const. 6th Amend right to a fair trial.” Dkt. No. 1. He further
06 explains that “[t]he accuser was incompetent because she could not accurately relate events
07 occurring contemporaneously with the alleged incident,” and that the memory of events that
08 occurred years earlier by an eight-year-old-child “is not reliable.” *Id.* In his petition to the
09 Washington Supreme Court, however, petitioner articulated this claim as “[w]here [A.J.]
10 could not accurately relate events occurring contemporaneously with the alleged incident at
11 issue, did the trial court err in finding her competent to testify?” Dkt. No. 11, Ex. 10. This
12 claim relied exclusively on part of a Washington case that cited no federal statute or case law,
13 nor any portion of the United States Constitution. Indeed, the cited state case analyzed how to
14 evaluate the competency of child testimony under Washington law. *Id.* at 12-13. Because
15 petitioner failed to articulate a federal basis for this claim to the Washington Supreme Court,
16 this claim is unexhausted. *Fields*, 401 F.3d at 1020-21.

17 Petitioner’s fourth claim is also unexhausted. He claims that “[p]rosecutorial
18 misconduct denied [petitioner] of his U.S. Const. 6th Amend. right to a fair trial.” Dkt. No. 1.
19 Specifically, he takes issue with the fact that “the prosecutor told the jury that defense counsel
20 was resorting to the age old strategy of blame the victim and pleaded with them not to fall for
21 it.” *Id.* Petitioner raised a prosecutorial-misconduct claim in his petition for review to the
22 Washington Supreme Court, but provided no federal basis for that claim. Like his first claim,
23 he cited Washington case law only and no federal case, statute, or Constitutional provision.
24 Neither state case relied upon by petitioner analyzed applicable federal law in any meaningful
25 way. *Fields*, 401 F.3d at 1020-22. This claim is, therefore, unexhausted.

26

ORDER
PAGE -6

01 2. Petitioner's Second Claim Is Considered Exhausted.

02 Petitioner's second claim for relief is properly exhausted. Petitioner's second claim for
 03 relief is that his "U.S. Const. 6th Amend right to confrontation was violated when the court
 04 admitted hearsay statements." Dkt. No. 1. In his petition before the Washington Supreme
 05 Court, petitioner's second claim explicitly cited the Sixth Amendment and the Supreme
 06 Court's decision in *Crawford v. Washington*, 541 U.S. 36 (2004). The petition maintained that
 07 "out-of-court statements by witnesses that are testimonial are barred under the Confrontation
 08 Clause unless the witnesses are unavailable and the defendant had a prior opportunity to cross
 09 examine them[.]" Dkt. No. 11, Ex. 10 (emphasis omitted). It went on to contend that "because
 10 [A.J.] was unavailable and [petitioner] had no prior opportunity for cross-examination, her out
 11 of court's [sic] statements should have been excluded. Their admission violated petitioner's
 12 Sixth Amendment right to confront." *Id.* Hence, petitioner presented the federal basis for his
 13 claim to the Washington Supreme Court.

14 3. Petitioner's Third Claim is Properly Exhausted.

15 Petitioner's third claim is properly exhausted. According to his petition, "Defense
 16 counsel rendered ineffective assistance, in violation of [petitioner's] U.S. Const. 6th Amend.
 17 right." Dkt. No. 1. Petitioner raised this claim in his petition for direct review when he raised
 18 the following issue: "Did [petitioner] receive ineffective assistance of counsel where defense
 19 counsel failed to object to testimony vouching for [N.L.'s] veracity and testimony by [A.J.'s]
 20 father that she exhibited behaviors he believed typical of a female child who had been
 21 molested?" Dkt. No. 11, Ex. 10. Although the petition's discussion of this issue did not
 22 explicitly cite any federal case law or constitutional provision, it did rely upon a Washington
 23 case that identified and discussed the federal standards for ineffective assistance of counsel. *Id.*
 24 *State v. Dawkins*, expressly referenced the "Sixth Amendment right to effective assistance of
 25 counsel," and quoted the standard articulated in *Strickland v. Washington*. 71 Wash. App. 902,
 26 863 P.2d 124 (Wash. App. Div. 2 1993) (citing *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S.668 (1984)).

01 Reference to a Washington case that analyzes a federal issue is sufficient for purposes of
 02 exhaustion. *Fields* 401 F.3d at 1020-22.

03 B. Because This Is a Mixed Petition, the Petitioner Has Two Options:
 04 Dismissal With An Opportunity to Amend, or Stay-and-Abeyance.

05 Because two of petitioner's four claims are exhausted, and the other two are not, this
 06 petition is "mixed." *Jackson v. Roe*, 425 F.3d 654, 658 (9th Cir. 2005) (citing *Rose v. Lundy*,
 07 455 U.S. 509, 522 (1982)). Therefore, the Court has two options.² First, the Court could
 08 dismiss all or part of the petition without prejudice. *Jefferson v. Budge*, 419 F.3d 1013, 1016-
 09 17 (9th Cir. 2005). Because dismissal of the entire petition could result in the statute of
 10 limitations expiring on the exhausted claims, a decision by petitioner to dismiss should be limited
 11 to dismissing his unexhausted claims. If petitioner chooses this option, he should file an
 12 amended petition asserting only his exhausted claims. *Id.*

13 Alternatively, the Court has discretion to stay the mixed petition to allow petitioner an
 14 opportunity to return to state court to present his unexhausted claims. *Jackson*, 425 F.3d at
 15 660-61. Once petitioner has properly exhausted his unexhausted claims, he could move forward
 16 with all of the claims in the current petition without fear that the statute of limitations might bar
 17 them. This "stay-and-abeyance" procedure, however, is only available in "limited
 18 circumstances" in which the Court finds that petitioner had "good cause" for failing to exhaust
 19 the claims. *Rhines v. Weber*, 125 S. Ct. 1528, 1535 (2005). It should not grant the stay if
 20 claims are meritless, or if petitioner engages in "abusive litigation tactics or intentional delay."

21 ²The Ninth Circuit also offers an third alternative. *Jackson v. Roe*, 425 F.3d 654, 658
 22 (9th Cir. 2005). Under this third alternative, the Court: (1) allows petitioner to amend his
 23 petition to remove the unexhausted claims; (2) stays and holds in abeyance the amended, fully
 24 exhausted petition so that petitioner can return to state court to exhaust his unexhausted
 25 claims; and (3) permits petitioner to return to Court to re-insert into his stayed petition the
 26 newly-exhausted claims. *Id.* at 658-59. This procedure is distinct from the stay-and-
 abeyance procedure described in *Rhines v. Weber*, 125 S. Ct. 1528, 1535 (2005), since it
 concerns abeyance of a fully-exhausted petition. The Supreme Court has not yet ruled on the
 propriety of this option, but *Jackson* noted that it may "fall into disuse" in the wake of *Rhines*,
 because it is "unnecessarily cumbersome." *Id.* at 661 n.10.

01 *Id.* Any stay that is granted should be for a reasonable period of time designed to allow
 02 petitioner to exhaust his claims properly. *Id.*

03 In this case, if the petitioner wishes to exercise this option, he should file a memorandum
 04 demonstrating why his petition should be stayed and held in abeyance, *e.g.*, good cause as to
 05 why he failed to exhaust the claim(s) described above.

06 C. An Evidentiary Hearing is Not Required.

07 In his reply brief, petitioner asserts (for the first time) that the Court should conduct an
 08 evidentiary hearing. Dkt. No. 12. Respondent argues that an evidentiary hearing is not
 09 required. Dkt. No. 8. Generally, an evidentiary hearing is appropriate in a § 2254 proceeding
 10 “when petitioner’s allegations, if proven, would entitle him to relief.” *Totten v. Merkle*, 137
 11 F.3d 1172, 1176 (9th Cir. 1998) (internal citations omitted). An evidentiary hearing, however,
 12 is not required when the Court is able to resolve the petition on the existing state court record.
 13 *Id.* To resolve the issues presented at this time by the petition, the Court need only review the
 14 record in its current form because it includes all of petitioner’s state court briefs and the
 15 decisions associated with them. Therefore, an evidentiary hearing is not necessary at this time.

16
 17 CONCLUSION

18 For the reasons discussed above, I recommend that the Court issue an order directing
 19 the petitioner to choose within thirty (30) days between amending his petition in order to
 20 proceed only with his exhausted claims, or alternatively, to show good cause as to why the
 21 Court should stay the entire petition pending the prosecution of his unexhausted claims in state
 22 court.

23 DATED this 24th day of March, 2006.

24
 25 
 26 JAMES P. DONOHUE
 United States Magistrate Judge